

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/508,252

that it would be reasonable to assume that the prior art granulated PTFE powder would also exhibit the claimed property (i.e., an electrostatic charge of not more than 10V).

Applicants respectfully traverse for the following reasons.

The present invention is characterized in that the granular polytetrafluoroethylene powder contains a segmented polyalkylene glycol in an amount of 10 to 70 ppm and has an electrostatic charge of not more than 10V. On the other hand, Asano et al discloses the use of a non-ionic surfactant in the granulation step, but does not disclose the use of a segmented polyalkylene glycol. Therefore, the present invention differs from Asano et al in that the granular polytetrafluoro ethylene powder of the invention contains a segmented polyalkylene glycol, whereas that of Asano et al does not. The significance of use of a segmented polyalkylene glycol is discussed below with reference to the results of comparative experimentation presented in the specification as follows.

Particularly, the granular polytetrafluoroethylene powder of the present invention not only has a low electrostatic charge, but also a molded article obtained from the granular polytetrafluoroethylene powder has excellent whiteness. In Examples 3-5 of the present specification, the Z values (whiteness) of the articles obtained from the granular polytetrafluoroethylene powders range from 96.7 to 111.1. See Table 1 at page 19 and Table 2 at page 24. On the other hand, in Example 1 of Asano et al, the Z value of the article obtained from the granular polytetrafluoroethylene powder not containing a segmented polyalkylene glycol was 68. See Table 1 of Asano et al bridging cols. 19-20. This is because the use of a non-ionic surfactant in Asano et al, such as the amine oxide type nonionic surfactant, typically colors the

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/508,252

molded article in the sintering step. However, use of a segmented polyalkylene does not impart coloration.

In view of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 11 and 12 are neither anticipated nor obvious over Asano et al and withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is respectfully requested.

Withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 11 and 12 is earnestly solicited.

In the event that the Examiner believes that it may be helpful to advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number indicated below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Abraham J. Rosner
Registration No. 33,276

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 25, 2003